#### REMARKS

# I. Status of the Claims:

Claims 1-7, 14, 15, 18-27, 34, 35, 38-43, 46 and 47 are currently pending in the application.

# II. Response to Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103:

Claims 1, 2 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saastamoinen ("Case Study on Exceptions", hereafter "Saastamoinen") in view of Peterson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,324,522, hereinafter "Peterson"). Claims 3 and 4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saastamoinen and Peterson, and further in view of Kojima (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0078862). Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saastamoinen, Peterson and Kojima in further view of the McKendrick article ("ResQ!Net.com Gives a Complete Makeover"). Claims 14, 18 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saastamoinen in view of Leal et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,311,437, hereafter "Leal"). Claims 15 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saastamoinen and Leal in further view of Sebastian (U.S. Patent No. 5,552,995). Claims 21, 22 and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saastamoinen in view of Peterson. Claim 26 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saastamoinen and Peterson in view of the Official Notice. Claims 34, 38 and 40 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saastamoinen in view of Leal. Claims 35 and 39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saastamoinen and Leal in further view of Sebastian. Claims 41 and 42 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saastamoinen in view of Peterson as applied

to claim 1 and further in view of the Official Notice. Claim 43 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saastamoinen in view of Peterson and the Official Notice, and further in view of Kojima as applied to claims 2 and 3. Claims 46 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saastamoinen in view of Leal as applied to claim 14 and further in view of the Official Notice. Claim 47 is rejected as being unpatentable over Saastamoinen in view of Sebastian.

The present inventions as recited in independent claims 1, 14. 21, 34, 41 and 46 are directed to a system, a method or a computer-readable medium implemented so that price information based on purchases at a plurality of bases is made available for display. The purchase price information reflects consumer purchases of objects and materials made at different bases (i.e., offices), which may vary depending on the states or countries where the bases are located. To this end, the information displayed is related to prices paid for *past* purchases made at the different bases. "Prices" in the present invention means "respective object prices at a plurality of bases of a certain object in a case where the certain object is purchased at the plurality of bases from each supplier corresponding to the plurality of bases."

In other words, in a case where a certain object is purchased, it could have happened that the prices are different by purchasing the object from a plurality of bases or suppliers. Therefore, in the present invention, this difference is prices paid for a certain object is taken into consideration. It does not appear that the cited prior art teaches or suggests this feature.

The Applicant respectfully submits the "points of delivery" of Saastamoinen (as relied upon by the Examiner) does not correspond to "bases" as recited in the claims. In the present claimed inventions, an "object" is purchased at "bases". However, the "points of

delivery" of Saastamoinen is <u>not</u> stored into an "order database" where "information" should be stored when a "purchase order" is placed, but rather the "points of delivery" of Saastamoinen is stored into a "storage database" where "information" should be kept when "items" are <u>received</u>.

In other words, the "points of delivery" of Saastamoinen is not a place where "object" or "item" is purchased.

Accordingly, Saastamoinen does not disclose or suggest the particular claimed information stored or to be stored in a database and the display or control of display of such information as they pertain to object(s) purchased at a plurality of bases. The remaining references, for example Peterson which is alleged to teach displaying, do not remedy these deficiencies in the Saastamoinen teachings. Furthermore, in view of the above, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the cited references in the manner suggested so that an "object" or "item" is purchased in a plurality of "bases" such as claimed.

Accordingly, claims 1-7, 14-15, 18-27, 34-35, 38-43 and 46-47 are believed to be distinguishable over the cited references, individually or in combination.

# **CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims and allowance of this application.

### **AUTHORIZATION**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 1232-4685.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. <u>13-4500</u>, Order No. <u>1232-4685</u>.

Dated: 2/7/06

By:

James Hwa

Registration No. 42,680

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

(202) 857-7887 Telephone (202) 857-7929 Facsimile

Correspondence Address:

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P. 3 World Financial Center New York, NY 10281-2101